

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,190	06/24/2003	Maria Elena Garcia Armenta	222992	1009
23460 7590 11/06/2007 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900			EXAMINER	
			WANG, SHENGJUN	
180 NORTH S CHICAGO, IL	STETSON AVENUE . 60601-6731		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*		1 A 12 42 A1	A				
,		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/602,190	, GARCIA ARMEN	TA ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Shengjun Wang	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES IN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMN 36(a). In no event, however, r will apply and will expire SIX (6, cause the application to become the application to be application to become the application to be applicati	IUNICATION. nay a reply be timely filed S) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Au	ugust 2007.					
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>8-12</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>8-12</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		• •			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ a)i	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received s have been received ity documents have l u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	I. I in Application No Deen received in this National	Stage			
	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		view Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date				
3) X Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	5) 🔲 Notic	ce of Informal Patent Application				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/602,190 Page 2

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 24, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffa et al. (EP 0 546 676) and Caruso (U.S. 5,919,826), and in further view of Saslawski et al. (US 6,372,255), Forrest et al. and Physicians' Desk Reference.
- 3. Raffa et al. teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising a tramadol compound and a non-steroid anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), and the method of using the same for treating pain. The composition provides benefits, such as less opioid side effects and synergistic pharmacological effects. See the abstract. Tramadol compounds may be any salts of tramadol, such as hydrochloride salt. See, particularly, page 3, lines 26-34. Any of the well-known NSAID may be used in the composition. The ratio of tramadol to NSAID is in the range of 1:1 to1:200. The composition may be prepared according to conventional pharmaceutical compounding techniques. Known pharmaceutical carrier and other excipients may be used in the composition

Art Unit: 1617

and the composition may be in the any of the known dosage forms, such as powders, capsules, etc. See, particularly, page 3, line 50 to page 4, line 49. Caruso discloses a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising tramadol and a NSAID, wherein ketorolac as one of the preferred NSAID. See, particularly, col. 6, lines 12-20, and claims 5 and 6.

- 4. The primary references do not teach expressly the particular carrier and excipients recited herein, or the particular salts of tramadol and ketorolac, or the amounts of each of the ingredients in the composition.
- 5. However, Saslawski et al. teaches that the particular carrier and excipients herein are well-known pharmaceutical carrier and excipients. See, particularly, column 5, line 37 to column 6, line 67. Forest et al. teaches that ketorolac is particularly known to be useful for pain management and is known to yield a synergistic effect when combined with opioid. See, particularly, the abstract. Further, Physicians' Desk Reference reveals that tramadol chloride and ketorolac tromethamine are the known salt currently employed clinically for tramadol and ketorolac.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to make a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride as herein recited. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride as herein recited because tramadol is known to be used with NSAID to yield synergistic analgesic effect, and ketorolac, a well known NSAID is known to potentiate analgesia are known to be used together and to provide benefit such as less opioid side effects and pharmacological

Art Unit: 1617

synergistic effects, and ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride are the particularly salts used clinically. Note the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., the amount of therapeutical agents, or the amounts of the well-known pharmaceutical excipients, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, <u>In re Boesch and Slaney</u> (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. Further note that "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Response to the Arguments

The amendments, remarks, and exhibit submitted August 24, 2007 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue that it is unpredictable that combining tramadol with NSAID would yield a synergistic analgesia effect. The arguments are unpersuasive. Applicants cited a single example of combination of tramadol and refecoxib showing no synergistic effect. However, as shown by the cited references, ketorolac is particularly known to yield synergistic effect when combined with opioid.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Shengjun Wang **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 1617

> > SHENGJUN WANG PRIMARY EXAMINER